

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, entry of this amendment and reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-19 have been amended. Claims 13-19 are pending in this application.

Claims 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gross* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0143564) in view of *Handman* (U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0212444).

The present claims now recite "storing favorite content lists created by respective users including a first user. . ."; "assigning points to the content in the favorite content list of each of the users other than first user in inverse proportion to a number of contents listed in the corresponding favorite content list;" generating a content list specific to the first user. . .;" "ranking content in the first user's generated content list based on the points assigned to the content;" and "generating a recommendation content list specific to the first user based on the ranked content. . . ." (Claim 13; claims 14-16 contain corresponding limitations).

Accordingly, the present invention generates a recommendation content list for a first user, based on a favorite content list created by the first user and the favorite content lists created by respective users other than the first user. The claimed invention further requires, in relevant part, assigning points to the content in each of the other users' respective favorite content lists "in inverse proportion to a number of contents listed in the corresponding favorite content list." "Common contents" identified by comparing the content in the favorite content lists are then ranked, based on the assigned points, and the first user's recommendation content

list is generated based on the ranked content. The "inverse proportion" point assignment feature, therefore, provides that the content of the favorite content lists of the other users having a larger number of contents contributes less to the generation of the first user's recommendation content list, than the content of the favorite content lists of the other users having a smaller number of contents. (See specification, for example, at paragraph [0138]).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied portions of *Gross* and *Handman* do not render the claimed invention obvious.

The Examiner admitted that *Gross* does not disclose the claimed inventive features of generating a content list for the first user based on favorite content lists created by respective users other than the first user, and generating the first user's recommendation content list based on the first user's generated content list, as required by the present claims. In addition, the cited portions of *Gross* appear to concern searching the results or history of prior network searches of a user. (See *Gross* at paragraph [0127]). In contrast to the Examiner's statements, nowhere do the applied portions of *Gross* disclose assigning points to the content in the favorite content lists of respective users other than the first user in "inverse proportion" to the number of contents listed in the other users' favorite content lists, as required by the claimed invention.

Further, the cited portions of *Handman* do not cure the deficiencies of *Gross* regarding the claimed invention. Although the cited portions of *Handman* appear to disclose creation of a favorite list by a user, *Handman* does not disclose that points are assigned to content in favorite content lists created by users other than a first user according to an "inverse proportion" point assignment feature, as required by the claimed invention, such that how much the content of the other user's

favorite content list contributes to the generation of a recommended favorite list for the first user is inversely proportional to the number of contents listed in the favorite content list of the other user.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, *Gross* and *Handman*, alone or in combination, fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Dated: July 15, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Davy E. Zoneraich

Registration No.: 37,267

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant